DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 480 123 TM 035 194

AUTHOR	Eddy, Pamela L.
TITLE	The Influence of Presidential Cognition and Power on Framing Change at Community Colleges.
PUB DATE	2003-04-00
NOTE	26p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Presidents; *Community Colleges; *Educational Change; Higher Education; *Leadership Styles; *Organizational Change

ABSTRACT

This study detailed how two community college presidents framed issues and events of change on their campuses based on their thinking, and it outlined the sources of power they used during the application of their plans for change. Both presidents were relatively new at their jobs; both had come from out of state to assume their new roles. A total of 28 interviews were conducted with the presidents and other administrators. One president used visionary framing to portray the college as a premier college of technology and everyday campus life. The other president used an operational framing in which challenges were presented as a series of problems to solve, with a focus on short-term change and attention to the moment. In both cases, leader cognition played a critical role in the presentation of change to campus members. Findings show how what the president thought about change influenced the way change occurred. (Contains 29 references.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

TM TMTR 0210

The Influence of Presidential Cognition and Power on Framing Change at Community Colleges

ED 480 123

American Educational Research Association
April 21, 2003
Chicago, Illinois

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
P. Eddy
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

Pamela L. Eddy, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Central Michigan University
Educational Administration and Community Leadership
Ronan 319B
Mt. Pleasant, MI 48559
989.774.1162
pamela.eddy@cmich.edu

TM035194

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Influence of Presidential Cognition and Power on Framing Change at Community Colleges

Introduction

Community college presidents approach organizational change on their campuses in a variety of ways. One element that influences how individuals approach change is how they first construct sense of a situation for themselves (Weick, 1995). For campus leaders, then, leader cognition plays a significant role in providing organizational direction for the institution (Eddy, 2003a). Bolman and Deal (1997) outline four cognitive lenses leaders may employ in their approach to the presidency. Each of the four perspectives highlights different manners to enact leadership on campus. In addition, in leading, college presidents use the various sources of power at their disposal (Morgan, 1997) to influence events on campus (Kelman, 1961). The research reported here questioned that if leader cognition occurs prior to framing change initiatives, how do presidents' cognitive frames influence the way in which they use their power to help focus campus attention on change initiatives?

This study details how two community college presidents framed issues and events of change on their campuses based on their thinking and outlines the sources of power they employed during the application of their plans for change. Framing by the president of change for campus members involved the choice of one set of meanings over another (Fairhurst & Sarr, 1996). Metaphorically, one can imagine framing by a leader as the college president using an empty picture frame that she or he then uses to bracket particular issues or change initiatives for campus members' focus.

Literature and Theoretical Framework

During periods of organizational change individuals find it necessary to make sense of situations that surprise them or are new situations, e.g., the hiring of a new president or the

implementation of new change initiatives on campus (Weick, 1979). Sensemaking is retroactive and dependent upon how the individual sees the situation impacting themselves (Weick, 1995). Sensemaking for leaders operates at a different level then for other organizational members since leaders also act as "sense-givers" (Thayer, 1988) and serve as interpreters of uncertainty for others in the organization. "The actions and utterances of leaders frame and shape the context of action in such a way that the members of that context are able to use the meaning thus created as a point of reference for their own action and understanding of the situation" (Smircich & Morgan, 1982). First, however, leaders must have an understanding of how they themselves understand the situation.

Research (Amey, 1992; Fairhurst & Sarr, 1996; Kuhnert & Lewis, 1989) suggests that how leaders make meaning for themselves affects how they in turn will make meaning for the organization. The role of cognition for the college president depends on the number of cognitive frames they use (Bensimon, 1991), if they are an "old" or "new" president (Neumann, 1989), and what type of institution they serve. Bolman and Deal (1997) outlined four organizational perspectives that leaders may use, including: structural, political, collegial, and symbolic. These lenses provide different vantage points on how college presidents approach framing change for their institutions. "The use of multiple frames to view an organization can provide for improved understanding of the dynamics of the institution, especially in times of turbulence" (Bensimon, 1991, p. 421). The ability of a college president to use more then one perspective as they frame change on campus enhances the accomplishment of sensemaking by campus members.

The basis of the structural frame is to achieve goals and objectives through standardization of operations. Authority is obtained via a hierarchy, where members have specific functional responsibilities. Work is divided to achieve results in the most efficient manner for the organization's context. "From this perspective, how the institution is organized and arranged

influences the processes through which its goals are set, decisions are made, and work is completed" (Mintzberg, as cited in Eckel, 1998, p. 16). Reliance on the structural organization of the institution is prevalent in this lens.

The human resources or collegial frame is concerned with the relationship between individuals and organizations. The essence of this frame is that the organization's employees have a symbiotic relation with the organization that can be fostered to the benefit of both. "Presidents who use [this] frame seek participative, democratic decision making and strive to meet people's needs and help them realize their aspirations (Bensimon, 1991, p. 422). In this case, individuals find their work meaningful and satisfying and the organization benefits from employee talent to succeed.

The political frame looks at the sources of political dynamics in organizations. "The political frame asserts that in the face of enduring differences and scarce resources, conflict is inevitable and power is a key resource" (Bolman, 1997, p. 164). In this frame organizational goals are not set solely by the president, rather through continuous negotiation and interaction among the key players. As goals and issues change, so do organizational coalitions and power bases.

The symbolic frame views the organization as a theater where various symbols and rituals aid in organizational meaning making. This frame allows complexity and ambiguity within the organization to be understood through a mediation of symbols, stories, myths, and ceremony. The symbolic frame allows organizations to take the same situation and interpret it differently, allowing for different meaning making and outcomes. Thus, in these "cultural systems of shared meanings and beliefs...organizational structures and processes are invented" (Bensimon, 1991, p. 422).

The enactment of the various organizational frames on campus utilizes various forms of power by the president. One manifestation of power is through persuasion and influence of others (Kelman, 1961) with leaders drawing power from a variety of sources. Kelman (1961) noted three

processes of social influence, including compliance, identification, and internalization. Compliance occurs when a member accepts the influence of the president because they hope the president then views them favorably. A member is compliant when the influencing agent is present, in this case when the president is there. Identification, on the other hand, occurs when the campus member seeks to emulate the behavior of the leader and is concerned with meeting the leader's expectation for role performance. Finally, internalization happens when the campus member accepts the influence of the leader because it is congruent with her or his own value system.

Morgan (1997) identified fourteen sources of power sources that organizational members may employ to attempt to sway others, starting with the power emanating from formal authority, "a form of legitimized authority that is respected and acknowledged by those with whom one interacts" (p. 172). Weber noted three characteristics of legitimate authority, including charisma, tradition, or the rule of law (Scott, 1998). Using the structure of the organization, with its assorted rules, regulations, and standard operating procedures thus provides power.

Control provides the greatest source of power. Control covers a broad spectrum of items, ranging from control of decision processes to control of knowledge and information to control of boundaries to control of technology to control of counterorganizations to control of scarce resources. Mintzberg (1991) also noted that the edge of the boundaries in the organization where uncertainty resides is a source of power. Since sensemaking occurs in situations of uncertainty, leaders have the potential to gain power during framing of ambiguous situations by providing direction and sensemaking for campus members. Power emanating from oversight of knowledge and information is particularly critical for this study.

Another of Morgan's power sources is power arising from the use of symbolism and the management of meaning. As W. I. Thomas (1951) observed, "If men define situations as real, they

are real in their consequences" (p. 572), hence individuals influencing reality construction for others in turn affect outcomes and gain power. Leaders acting as gatekeepers of facts supply information to the organization that favors their point of view and the view desired for framing for campus members. The ability to persuade others to redefine realties that allow for the achievement of one's desires is at the center of this type of power. "Leadership ultimately involves an ability to define the reality of others" (Morgan, 1997, p. 189). Morgan defines three aspects of the power source of symbolic management. These parts include the use of imagery, the use of theater, and the use of gamesmanship. When leaders manage symbolic representations within the organization they shape patterns within the culture, which allow for achievement of their objectives. Using theatrical symbols sets the stage for leaders in meaning making. The meaning derived from the tone put forth by leaders in the staging of day-to-day events and special activities lends power to leaders in framing reality for the campus. In gamesmanship, players have their own set of rules for operating within the system and have an understanding of what is at stake.

Other power sources outlined by Morgan (1997) include: the ability to cope with uncertainty; interpersonal alliances; networks and control of "informal organization;" gender and the management of gender relations; structural factors that define the stage of action; the power one already has; and the ambiguity of power. While the act of framing does not confer power to leaders, leaders may gain power as they successfully frame realities for campus members that correspond to the desired directions of the college president. Of interest in this study was what power sources leaders drew upon when framing and how they utilized the sources of power outlined by Morgan (1997).

The theoretical framework used in this study incorporated looking for elements aiding in the construction of the leaders' cognitive perspectives and identifying ways in which leaders used power to elicit organizational change. While organizational change provided a forum for investigating the

influence of the leader's cognitive processes and use of power, it was not the focus of the study. Rather, the instance of change provided a platform to observe the leaders' cognitive orientation to framing change and the identification of the power sources used to influence sensemaking.

Methodology

This study employed a multiple case study perspective (Merriam, 1998; Yin, 1994) of leaders at two two-year colleges of technology located within a state higher education system that includes a total of five two-year colleges of technology, three four-year colleges of technology, and some 30 community colleges. The design began with the purposeful selection of sites for the cases. The two case sites were part of a smaller study conducted in 1999 that investigated how the state's five two-year colleges of technology dealt with a threat of closure through the formation of a strategic alliance (Eddy, 2003b). The basis of selection of the two college presidents for this study was their recent tenure within the state's system of higher education and the fact that both presidents came from out of state to assume their new roles. President Pat Peri assumed his presidency at Manley State College in the spring of 1998, while President Jessica Fields became the president at Dawson State College in the fall of 1999. Pseudonyms were used for all participants and for the names of the colleges.

The prime source of data collection was individual interviews. Interviews were audiotaped and transcribed verbatim. Each college president was interviewed to obtain a better understanding of how they framed organizational change on their campus. In addition, members of the president's cabinet, faculty, department chairs and deans, and information directors were interviewed. A total of 28 interviews were conducted; 15 at Dawson State College and 13 at Manley State College. Document analysis complemented interview data collection.

Category construction (Merriam, 1998) evolved from an initial coding scheme correlating with the research question. The naming of the categories reflected final interpretation of the data. The use of a peer reviewer helped to strengthen the analytic process (Creswell, 1998).

Findings

Findings from this research uncovered two different framing perspectives used by the site college presidents. The first was visionary framing by President Peri. In visionary framing the Peri sought to make connections between the future vision for the college as a premiere college of technology and everyday campus life. He highlighted successes, including the implementation of a laptop university program, and saw opportunities in challenges facing the college. Associated with this framing perspective, Peri utilized two of Bolman and Deal's (1997) lenses most predominantly, namely the human resources and symbolic perspectives. President Fields, on the other hand, employed operational framing. In this case, she presented challenges to the campus as a series of problems to solve and used step-by-step procedures to aid campus members in obtaining short-term goals. Fields focused campus attention in the present moment. Her organizational perspective most often employed a political and structural orientation.

Fields emphasized the establishment of procedures to make organizational decisions as seen in her implementation of program reviews and work on retention when she arrived at Manley State. In describing the way in which President Fields enacted program deactivations, the Vice President of Academic Affairs noted,

> Well, what she did is that in October she asked all supervisors and function heads to answer 14 questions. She called it a comprehensive plan. Some of the questions were information that we knew already,

> but we wanted to see if our data matched with what they said. Some of them were open ended, including, what are your strengths? What are your weaknesses? How could you maximize enrollments if you are not already there?

Field's also mediated with on-campus groups vying for resources. One result of the campus program review process was the placing of department in an "in jeopardy" category, which indicated that the program needed to shore up enrollments and increase its fiscal contribution to the college. Field's indicated, "Programs we were concerned about we placed 'in jeopardy' and that was a very structured process where we met with the faculty and staff. They had a specific timeframe where they, we together, had to accomplish specific goals." Limited campus resources were available to assist strengthening these borderline programs.

The state in which Dawson State College is located operates with a central coordinating board, with state funding tied to enrollment numbers. Fields indicated she paid a great deal of attention to understanding the rules and policies governing the funding process. She noted, "Our relationship with [the central board] is very good and that's important to Dawson....I need to pay attention to politics." Fields also noted negotiating between two campus factions consisting, on the one hand, of senior faculty, and, on the other hand, newer faculty to the campus. The president said, "I'm still concerned with what I would consider a split among the faculty—in terms of junior/senior. In the best of all worlds the people who were unhappy would leave." Other campus informants supported this view of a divided campus.

President Peri used collegial and symbolic perspectives in outlining change. He worked hard to motivate campus members to participate in a new laptop program and to feel a part of the planning process. Peri sought to create shared meaning at Manley State College regarding the future direction

of the campus and the role of technology in that future. The president shared the following metaphor to capture his vision for the campus, "In a way our goal is to graduate students who not only have a very valuable degree, but walk across the stage with a degree in one hand, the laptop loaded with software—it's theirs—in the other, and their own business waiting for them when they walk off the stage." Two other study participants shared this exact same scenario when discussing the changes taking place at the college. Symbolically Peri used this vignette to capture and share his vision for the campus. One of Peri's first campus wide initiatives was to initiate a series of strategic planning sessions. Out of these sessions developed seven strategic goals for the campus. Participants indicated they felt their perspectives were represented in this campus plan, referring often to the plan and how it guided the campus.

Leader Cognition

An antecedent to how the president framed change on campus was leader cognition. How the president made meaning for himself or herself impacted how they in turn presented their initiatives for change to the rest of the campus. Elements influencing cognition included the past experiences of the leader, their sources for networking, the resources they relied on to make decisions, how they defined change (e.g., long-term or discrete), and how they assimilated the input of others. How the leader presented herself or himself during their interview for the presidency foreshadowed how they framed change once selected as president. Findings confirmed that how the leaders first made meaning for themselves influenced how they framed change operations for other campus members.

Visionary Cognition

When President Peri discussed his thinking about organizational change he emphasized the strategic direction for the college. Peri stated, "The first thing I had to do was engage the college in a strategic planning concept or process from which ideas emerged. Not in purely the way I though of them, but in expanded ways." Peri not only obtained input from campus members, but also drew connections between disparate topics and the vision for the college. He noted, "I read a lot of periodicals and I try to draw parallels…Taking things that apply over here [from other colleges or businesses] and applying them to the academic world."

In getting the campus to focus on the future vision of the college as a premiere college of technology, Peri noted,

> Now part of the change is that I didn't dwell on, at no point did I dwell on the negatives or even really talk about them much. The lack of funding, the sort of depressed state of the physical condition of the campus. I started working on the new stuff while I was dealing with the other stuff. I guess the message there was that I am trying to get them to take their eyes off the problem all of the time and look at where we're headed. Join me and this is where we're going.

Campus informants did not reveal concerns about the fiscal state of operations. Instead, they commented on the construction of new campus buildings and the receipt of national awards acknowledging their laptop programs.

Operational Cognition

President Fields pulled from her past experiences in enrollment management in her approach to new responsibilities as president. Fields stated that she drew heavily from her personal network when making decisions. One cabinet member elaborated further, "I think President Fields is very logical. I think she really weighs the pros and cons of the alternatives. I think she gathers a lot of information. I think she is rational, careful, thoughtful." Fields relied on understanding the system of higher education in the state and, in turn, using that information to make decisions for the advantage of the college.

Conversations with the president and campus informants often related to the fiscal solvency of the college. The president noted, "Financially the college had been hit over, and over, and over." Informants commented that were constantly being asked to do more with less. After establishing the academic program review during her first year on campus, President Fields eliminated 14 academic programs. She noted, "There were no sacred cows. We put everything on the table." In concentrating on increasing enrollment numbers on the campus, Fields discovered that the campus practice was to have students as full time students, but at the lowest possible credit hour load. The president realized that having a higher full-time equivalent student enrollment would translate to increased funding for Dawson. She commented, "I did a series of educating that one way to help ourselves was to makes sure students were at maximum or closer to maximum credit hours for students to graduate on time." By following the funding rules, Fields was able to increase state dollar allocations to the college.

Power

Each president used a variety of power sources during change efforts on their campuses. While some of the categories of power sources were the same for both leaders, the ways in which they used their power associated with their way of thinking and the organizational lenses they employed in leading their campuses.

Visionary Power

Peri's use of power aligned with his prime organizational perspectives, namely Bolman and Deal's (1997) symbolic and collegial lenses. When President Peri described the presentation of the strategic plan to the campus he said, "Of course, then I used the bully-pulpit, no that's the wrong term, then I used the power of the presidency to communicate those goals and constantly refined them..." Many informants reported motivation to perform since they felt "free to do their job" without interference from Peri. The president also noted, "Part of my job is persuasion, but persuasion is a little different than manipulation." Although, Peri outlined the vision for the campus, staff chose to follow this vision because it matched their own value system.

From the strategic planning sessions a logo was developed that symbolized the tri-fold vision of Manley State College in solid academics, encouraging entrepreneurial activities for both students and staff, and infusing technology throughout the organization to accomplish these goals. The blending of this campus vision was also supported by the hosting of the beginning of the year campus forum in the new automotive center. Not only did this action highlight for campus members a tangible positive growth with being in a new building, it showcased the use of new technology in the vocational trades on the campus. The focus on the vocational programs also served to support the role they played in supporting the vision of the college. As Peri noted, he was conscious in his

management of meaning for campus members in what he highlighted by not calling attention to negatives. Given the deteriorating state of other buildings on campus, hosting the forum in a new building symbolically called attention instead to areas of growth.

During his first presentation to campus members President Peri opened by saying, "Please call me Pat." Peri also was visible on campus at sporting events, walking the halls, and in the gym at noon playing basketball. One director noted, "He is just out there in front of everybody. Whether it be in a large group or a small group, or one on one, walking around campus shaking hands." Peri also sent "Presidential Ramblings" via e-mail to update campus members on the status of work projects. His collegial manner continued in his formal presentations. In preparing for his campus wide forums, the director of public relations noted, "He dislikes formal. He'll go up in front of the campus with a list of bullet points of things to talk about, not a prepared speech." As one cabinet member commented, "There is now more a sense of camaraderie, a sense of where we are going somewhere and what we need to do to make it work."

President Peri did, however, also make use of some power sources correlating to the structural and political orientations. After the strategic plan was formulated by the campus, he shifted through the comments and collected the most commonly agreed upon ideas. He noted, "Then it was my job to put that into context—read it, study it, reorganize it, and then be able to communicate it succinctly and directly." From this plan came seven strategic goals and under each of the goals were specific objectives. The objectives were translated into an operational long-range plan that was reviewed annually. Another instance of use of structure was evident in the implementation of the pilot program for the laptop university. A campus wide request for proposals (RFP) was put out to which departments responded. Interested areas would put in a proposal to be a part of the initial group piloting the program. Peri used the lever of power associated with scarce resources in the

implementation of the laptop program. As the registrar noted, "People who use the technology in their classes get the best classrooms. Others that had traditionally had those classrooms are beginning to change and incorporate technology into their curriculums so they can access the better classrooms."

Peri made use of the power of his knowledge of how to initiate and implement a laptop university. He used his past experience and the connections he had from his previous campus to shorten the time to start a new laptop university at Manley State. The control of the technology itself was a source of power for Peri, as witnessed with the assignment of classrooms and the piloting of the laptop program.

Operational Power

Fields' organizational perspectives were more structural and political. President Fields used the rules of the central system hierarchy to initiate changes on campus and worked with relationship building, both on campus and with the central office. One new faculty noted, "She is willing to use her authority, but she uses it I think fairly gracefully. Other presidents that I've worked for have either not been that graceful or have been afraid of their own authority." Fields created structures as one means of leveraging her power.

As noted, one of the processes she instituted consisted of a program review. The outcomes of the review of academic areas targeted ways to increase enrollment on campus. Reflecting on the first round of reviews Fields commented, "That helped me because there was kind of a campus-wide buy in that 'Oh! She's really going to do what she said she would do!'" Campus attention to the president's authority as manifested through the elimination of some academic programs highlighted one manner of power usage at Dawson State College by the president.

President Fields made a number of organizational changes upon arrival at Dawson. Changes occurred in the inner leadership cabinet with respect to reporting assignments and consolidation of areas. In addition she made changes to middle management. Fields commented, "We had seven department chairs and now we have four deans." The deans are classified as management versus the former role of chairs as joint faculty members and administrators. One faculty member noted that when he has programming concerns he now feels more comfortable in the dean structure since deans as management confidential positions could plead the case of faculty better to upper administration. The same faculty continued, "I'm of the old school and what I mean by that is that administrators are hired to do the work of the faculty in the sense of I feel administrators' main job is to make the faculty's job easier." As a result of the organizational structure change he felt that there was a lot of bottom up contributions from faculty.

Informants mentioned the importance of the relationship for Dawson State College with the central state agency. One dean noted, "I think that we have become more marketing focused and managing enrollments and growing enrollments....Jessica is very, very good with numbers and money. She understands the state budgeting in a way that not very many people do." Another vice president said, "I think she does extremely well in working with the legislators, the community people and probably a lot of the people further removed from her have no clue how much time that takes." Relationship building with the state was an important component for Fields.

Another relationship issue commented on by many participants was among the faculty. One dean stated, "I think there's a real gap on this campus between newer and older faculty personnel....I think a lot of younger people or newer faculty members wonder what the heck the older faculty members are gripping about." The faculty senate president noted, "I'm the new presider of the faculty senate and that's been a touchy issue. It was very ineffective for a few years." She continued

by discussing how some faculty issues centered on trusting administrators. The faculty senate on campus consisted of both faculty and staff. President Fields reflected, "I think it will be interesting in the next year or two to see how the leadership in the faculty evolves and what their issues are....I think how the evolvement of the faculty role with the good position of programs can help the college—if we could pay attention to our knitting!" The president pushed faculty to become more involved in the senate and attempted to make the group more viable. In this area, as in others, she relied on the structure of the organization to provide the framework for change. Her hope was that with upcoming retirements that some of the internal tensions among faculty would dissipate.

President Fields also made some use of the power structures correlating to the symbolic and collegial perspectives. Upon arrival on campus she instituted a campus wide holiday gathering. Her vice president of administrative affairs suggested charging guests to attend. Fields said, "No! We're not going to charge. This is going to be a celebration, a party that we get together and have a good time because we're here and because we're a community." She commented on the lack of community at the institution and her desire to establish a set of traditions to build unity. Her use of the campus wide gathering served as a symbolic representation of her desire to build bridges and also fostered collegiality.

Discussion

Neumann (1995) determined how presidents presented information to campus members influenced the sense these members made of the situations facing them. This study found that a precursor to how the presidents framed change on campus was how they first made sense of the change for themselves. The cognitive perspectives of the campus leaders influenced the framing of

change for others and ultimately how campus members made sense of the change. Peri and Fields utilized power levers to influence campus members that complimented their cognitive orientations.

In analyzing the use of the power sources by the presidents outlined by Morgan (1997) a pattern emerged that correlated with the presidents' use of organizational frames. President Fields framing predominantly used a structural and political perspective. The power sources she employed relied heavily on the use of organizational structure as witnessed with her realignment of the reporting structure with the deans and the implementation of a process for program review. Fields' reliance on the hierarchy reinforced the power of her formal authority within the organization. She attempted to control the boundaries of the organization through the implementation of rules and processes, using the organizational structure to support these.

Fields' political orientation manifested in her relationships with the central state agency and with her employee factions. She garnered power through her alliances with these various groups and was attentive to fostering relationships. Fields commented, "I'm pushing the Chancellor to appoint people to the college council who won't just be political hacks, but who will be people who are prepared to give money." The relationship Fields built with the Chancellor allowed her the opportunity to seek this request. Within the employee ranks she is appointing newer faculty to committee work and participants reported high levels of engagement for this group of faculty. Moreover, she worked with historically counterorganizations like the faculty senate to build consensus.

Another power lever Fields employed was the use of scarce resources. Her use of these means complimented both her political and structural framing. Resources were rewarded to programs that were performing well, while others were placed "in jeopardy." The formal process of assessment of programs relied heavily on a step-by-step process.

President Peri employed his power through his prime organizational lenses of symbolism and collegiality. He worked on managing meaning and creating a reality for campus members with a basis on a vision of the college as a premiere college of technology. As previously noted, Peri was conscious of not calling attention to the negative issues on campus, rather focusing campus attention on recent awards for the laptop program. The telling and retelling of the vignette of the vision of the college student graduate walking across the stage with a laptop in hand served as a focal point for campus members on how to visualize the college. Hosting the opening college meeting in the new automotive center likewise focused attention on the growth of the campus and the use of technology throughout the academic programs.

The control of technology, in and of itself, was a power lever for Peri. The choice of programs for receiving resources for initiating laptop programs called attention to the focus on technology and highlighted how others in turn could receive resources. Opening the request for proposals to participate in the laptop initiative to campus members was another symbolical means to call attention to the forward focus and vision of the use of technology on campus. Peri's past experience and expertise on implementing a laptop program also fosters a means of power for him.

President Peri fostered a collegial relationship with campus members through his informal style, his presence on and about campus, and his use of the strategic planning process. Participants reported feeling like they had a voice on campus and were heard. Peri gained power by his use of knowledge sharing in these collegial settings and his use of internal alliances.

In this research study both college presidents sought to influence campus members. Using Kelman's topology of influence, President Peri's influence falls somewhere between identification and internalization. He spoke of his enthusiasm for change at Manley State College and campus members commented that his enthusiasm was contagious. Peri gained influence by demonstrating

important personal characteristics and a strong conviction in his belief that technology was the vehicle for organizational change at Manley State College. Many informants reported motivation to perform since they felt free "to do their job" without interference from Peri. Although, Peri outlined the vision for the campus, staff chose to follow this vision because it matched their own value system.

President Fields' influence consisted more of compliance or identification. Campus members complied with her requests to establish a review process for program evaluation, but did not necessarily embrace this process. The lack of a common thread of change other than enrollment growth made it harder for individuals to do more than comply with assigned tasks. Internalization of influence within a structural perspective is problematic since a major component of this lens is formulization of goals, leaving little room for identification with individual's value systems.

Conclusion

Often research on college presidents revolves around discussions of traits (Bennis, 1984), social power theory and transformational leadership theory (Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989), cultural and symbolic perspectives (Neumann, 1989), and more recently, team leadership (Bensimon & Neumann, 1993) and webs of inclusion (Helgesen, 1995). This research confirmed that leader cognition plays a critical role in leadership on campus, particularly in how framing choices influence the presentation of change for campus members. The campus presidents first made meaning for themselves prior to outlining or bracketing the focus of attention for others on campus.

The findings from this study indicated that how the president thought about change itself influenced how they framed change on their campuses. For example, President Peri thought about change as far reaching and pervading all aspects of campus life. President Fields, on the other hand, saw change as more incremental, with a series of steps ultimately resulting in the desired change.

Leader cognition influenced both what these college presidents saw as the goal of change and the strategies necessary to obtain change (Eddy, 2003a).

Similarly, the use of power by the leaders was based on leader cognition. The presidents underlying cognitive schema, thus, impacted the ways in which they influenced others. Each president associated more closely with particular types of influence that correlated with their underlying thinking. For Peri, power levers involving symbolism and the management of meaning, the ability to work with uncertainty, and the management of technology provided the core of his means of influence. Whereas for Fields her prime power levers involved using organizational rules, controlling decision making, and using structural factors to define the field of action.

College presidents and potential presidential candidates need to incorporate into their leadership development the use of reflection to uncover their cognitive orientation and its associated means of enactment. When leaders are in tune with how their thinking perspectives influences outcomes and actions, they can consciously use power levers that complement their meaning schema and become aware of levers they may naturally avoid, ultimately recognizing that a combination of both types of power levels provides more utility. The double loop learning (Argyris, 1992) that can result from internal reflection by the president can enhance not only personal consciousness raising for the individual leader, but can highlight for the leader more courses of action for the organization.

Some research argues for presidents to use their power for serious collaborations and to strengthen the office of the president (Keohane, 1998). Without contemplation of the influence of the president's cognitive schema on ultimate framing of change on campus, however, this tactic may result in unintended outcomes. Others (Pfeffer, 1991; Reisman, 1996) argue that presidents are in fact limited in the power they have on campus. In reality, the answer most likely lies somewhere in between, with presidents having power to do many things on campus. The question remains,

however, how presidents chose to use this power. A conscious contemplation of the links between cognition, framing choices, and the power levers associated with their preferences could give presidents more options.

References

Amey, M. J. (1992). *Cognitive constructions of leadership.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Argyris, C. (1992). *On organization learning.* Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Bennis, W. (1984). Four traits of leadership. In J. N. Williamson (Ed.), *Leader-Manager* (pp. 197-214). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Bensimon, E. (1991). The meaning of "good presidential leadership": A frame analysis. In M. Peterson (Ed.), *Organization and governance in higher education* (pp. 421-431). Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster Custom publishing.

Bensimon, E. M., & Neumann, A. (1993). *Redesigning collegiate leadership: Teams and teamwork in higher education.* Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Bensimon, E., Neumann, A., & Birnbaum, R. (1989). *Making sense of administrative leadership: The "L" word in higher education* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1 ED 316 074 MF-01; PC-05). Washington, D.C.: The George Washing University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. (1997). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishers.

Eckel, P. D. (1998). *How institutions discontinue academic programs: Making potentially adverse decisions in an environment of shared decision making.* Unpublished dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.

Eddy, P. L. (2003a, April). *The impact of presidential cognition on framing organizational change*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Council for the Study of Community Colleges, Dallas, TX.

Eddy, P. L. (2003b). Change in community colleges through strategic alliances: A case study. *Community College Review, 30*(4), 1-20.

Fairhurst, G. T., & Sarr, R. A. (1996). *The art of framing: Managing the language of leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Helgesen, S. (1995). *The web of inclusion: A new architecture for building great organizations*. New York: Currency/Doubleday.

Kelman, H. (1961). Process of opinion change. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 25*(1), 57-78.

Keohane, N. O. (1998). More power to the president? *Presidency, 1*(2), 12-17.

Kuhnert, K. W., & Lewis, P. (1989). Transactional and transformation leadership: A constructive/developmental analysis. In W. E. Rosenbach & R. L. Taylor (Eds.), *Contemporary issues in leadership* (2nd ed., pp. 192-206). Boulder: Westview Press.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Mintzberg, H. (1991). The professional bureaucracy. In M. Person (Ed.), *Organization and governance in higher education* (4th ed., pp. 53-75). Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster Custom Printing.

Morgan, G. (1997). *Images of organization*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Neumann, A. (1989). Strategic leadership: The changing orientations of college presidents. *Review of Higher Education, 12*(Winter 1989), 137-51.

Pfeffer, J. (1991). The ambiguity of leadership. In M. Person (Ed.), *Organization and governance in higher education* (4th ed., pp. 345-354). Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster Custom Printing.

Reisman, D. (1996). Afterward: Reflections on the college presidency. *New Directions for Higher Education*, (93), 85-87.

Scott, W. R. (1998). *Organizations: Rational, natural, and open systems*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Smircich, L., & Morgan, G. (1982). Leadership: The management of meaning. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 18*(3), 257-273.

Thayer, L. (1988). Leadership/communication: A critical review and a modest proposal. In G. M. Goldhaber & G. A. Barnett (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational communication* (pp. 231-263). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Thomas, W. I. (1951). *Social behavior ad personality*. New York: Social Science Research Council.

Weick, K. E. (1979). *The social psychology of organizing* (2nd ed.). New York: Random House.

Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Yin, R. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

TM035194

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: The Influence of Presidential Cognition and Power on Framing Change at Community Colleges	
Author(s): Pamela L. Eddy	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date: 4/03

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☒

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Signature: Pamela L. Eddy	Printed Name/Position/Title: Asst. Prof. Pamela Eddy
Organization/Address: Central Michigan University Rowan 319B, Mount Pleasant, MI 48859	Telephone: 989 774-1162 FAX: E-Mail Address: pamela.eddy@cmich.edu Date: 7/25/03

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfacility.org

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2001)